



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/679,660	10/06/2003	Bradley J. Eldred	MICROPURE-01	4115
7590 Law Offices - Eric R. Benson, Esq. 6A Hillside Lane Westford, VT 05494			EXAMINER	
			CHORBAJI, MONZER R	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1744		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/03/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/679,660	ELDRED, BRADLEY J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	MONZER R. CHORBAJI	1744	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 67-70 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 67-70 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/05/2007</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This final action is in response to the amendment received on 01/26/2007

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 67 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomioka et al (U.S.P.N. 5,510,109) in view of Yahya et al (U.S.P.N. 5,217,626) and further in view of Choi (Bulletin of the Korean Fisheries Society) and Kobayashi et al (U.S.P.N. 4,909,986).

Regarding claims 67 and 70, Tomioka teaches a disinfecting composition that includes the following: a fluid (col.2, lines 48-67, col.3, lines 1-17 where the fluid is the solution that contains the disinfecting composition within), copper metal (col.4, lines 4-10) is dissolved in the fluid, silver metal (col.4, lines 4-10) is dissolved in the fluid, alcohol (col.5, lines 59-62) is dissolved in the fluid and plant extract (col.3, lines 52-55)

Art Unit: 1744

is dissolved in the fluid as well. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that each of the components is present in the fluid within a certain concentration range. However, Tomioka does not specifically teach concentration values for the metal ions, the use and the concentration range values of grapefruit seed extract and the use and the concentration range values for glycerin. Yahya's water disinfection composition includes copper ions at a concentration value of about 0.05 mg/L (col.4, lines 1-4) and silver ions at a concentration value of about 0.005 mg/L (col.4, lines 4-6) that results in improved microorganism inactivation in water systems (col.3, lines 17-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Tomioka copper and silver ions concentration values as taught by Yahya since copper and silver ions at such concentration values exhibit improved levels of inactivation of bacteria, viruses, fungi and parasites in water systems (Yahya, col.3, lines 15-19).

Yahya does not teach the use and the concentration range values of grapefruit seed extract and also the use and the concentration ranges for glycerin. Choi teaches that grapefruit seed extract at a concentration range of 50 ppm (ppm= mg/L) completely inhibits growth of various pathogenic microorganisms (lines 6-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute one or more of the plant extracts of Tomioka with grapefruit seed extract as taught by Choi for its strong antimicrobial activity (Choi, lines 1-5) and to add it at a concentration of 50 mg/L as taught by Choi since at such a concentration value the growth of many harmful microorganisms is inhibited (Choi, lines 5-9).

Art Unit: 1744

Choi does not teach the use and the concentration ranges for glycerin. Kobayashi teaches including a preservative or antiseptic compound such as glycerol (col.9, lines 57-62) into the deodorizing composition at legally accepted levels. Furthermore, Kobayashi teaches (example 12, columns 12-16) adding to the deodorant solution glycerol (glycerin and glycerol are synonyms) at a concentration value of 200 ppm. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Tomioka composition by adding glycerol as taught by Kobayashi since at such a concentration value, glycerin acts as an antiseptic agent that leads to the additional destruction of microorganisms in combination with metal ions and grapefruit seed extract components.

4. Claim 68 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomioka et al (U.S.P.N. 5,510,109) in view of Yahya et al (U.S.P.N. 5,217,626) and further in view of Choi (Bulletin of the Korean Fisheries Society).

Tomioka teaches a disinfecting composition that includes the following: a fluid (col.2, lines 48-67, col.3, lines 1-17 where the fluid is the solution that contains the disinfecting composition within), copper metal (col.4, lines 4-10) is dissolved in the fluid, silver metal (col.4, lines 4-10) is dissolved in the fluid, alcohol (col.5, lines 59-62) is dissolved in the fluid and plant extract (col.3, lines 52-55) is dissolved in the fluid as well. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that each of the components is present in the fluid within a certain concentration range. However, Tomioka does not specifically teach concentration values for the metal ions and the use and the concentration range values of grapefruit seed extract. Yahya's water disinfection composition includes

copper ions at a concentration value of about 0.05 mg/L (col.4, lines 1-4) and silver ions at a concentration value of about 0.005 mg/L (col.4, lines 4-6) that results in improved microorganism inactivation in water systems (col.3, lines 17-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Tomioka copper and silver ions concentration values as taught by Yahya since copper and silver ions at such concentration values exhibit improved levels of inactivation of bacteria, viruses, fungi and parasites in water systems (Yahya, col.3, lines 15-19).

Yahya does not teach the use and the concentration range values of grapefruit seed extract; however, Choi teaches that grapefruit seed extract at a concentration range of 50 ppm (ppm= mg/L) completely inhibits growth of various pathogenic microorganisms (lines 6-8). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute one or more of the plant extracts of Tomioka with grapefruit seed extract as taught by Choi for its strong antimicrobial activity (Choi, lines 1-5) and to add it at a concentration of 50 mg/L as taught by Choi since at such a concentration value the growth of many harmful microorganisms is inhibited (Choi, lines 5-9).

5. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomioka et al (U.S.P.N. 5,510,109) in view of Yahya et al (U.S.P.N. 5,217,626) and further in view of Kobayashi et al (U.S.P.N. 4,909,986).

Tomioka teaches a disinfecting composition that includes the following: a fluid (col.2, lines 48-67, col.3, lines 1-17 where the fluid is the solution that contains the

Art Unit: 1744

disinfecting composition within), copper metal (col.4, lines 4-10) is dissolved in the fluid, silver metal (col.4, lines 4-10) is dissolved in the fluid, alcohol (col.5, lines 59-62) is dissolve in the fluid and plant extract (col.3, lines 52-55) is dissolved in the fluid as well. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that each of the components is present in the fluid within a certain concentration range. However, Tomioka does not specifically teach concentration ranges for the metal ions as recited in claim 69 and the use and the concentration range values for glycerin. Yahya's water disinfection composition includes copper ions at a concentration value of about 0.05 mg/L (col.4, lines 1-4) and silver ions at a concentration value of about 0.005 mg/L (col.4, lines 4-6) that results in improved microorganism inactivation in water systems (col.3, lines 17-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Tomioka copper and silver ions concentration values as taught by Yahya since copper and silver ions at such concentration values exhibit improved levels of inactivation of bacteria, viruses, fungi and parasites in water systems (Yahya, col.3, lines 15-19).

Yahya does not teach the use and the concentration ranges for glycerin. Kobayashi teaches including a preservative or antiseptic compound such as glycerol (col.9, lines 57-62) into the deodorizing composition at legally accepted levels. Furthermore, Kobayashi teaches (example 12, columns 12-16) adding to the deodorant solution glycerol (glycerin and glycerol are synonyms) at a concentration value of 200 ppm. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Tomioka composition by adding glycerol as taught

by Kobayashi since at such a concentration value, glycerin acts as an antiseptic agent that leads to the additional destruction of microorganisms in combination with metal ions and grapefruit seed extract components.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 01/26/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 5-7 of the Remarks section, Applicant argues that using copper and silver ions only without potassium permanganate would not function as a disinfectant as taught by Yahya and that Yahya only teaches adding potassium permanganate to copper and silver ions. Tomioka teaches combining copper and silver ions in an aqueous solution without specifically showing concentration ranges. Yahya is combined to show that copper and silver ions at concentration ranges cited by the instant claims falls within his teachings regardless of the presence of potassium permanganate since the instant claims do not exclude the presence of potassium permanganate. The transitional phrase "consisting essentially of" in the instant claims does not exclude the presence of other components as long as the basic and novel material qualities of the subject matter are not altered. See MPEP 2111.03. In obviousness rejections, Applicant should address the combinations not the individual references.

On pages 7-9 of the Remarks section, Applicant argues that Tomioka teaches against the use of glycerin, since it is a known humectant, while Tomioka requires prompt drying, that providing glycerin into Tomioka would not result in the prompt drying of Tomioka's composition, that the use of glycerin would inhibit the deposit of Tomioka's

composition on substrates thereby destroying the function of the alcohol present in Tomioka's and that Tomioka uses alcohol as a solvent that is evaporated and not as a component dissolved per liter of the fluid as required by the claims. Tomioka discloses mixing copper, silver, plant extract and alcohol in an aqueous solution. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that the concentration values of Tomioka are based on a certain total volume. This concentration per liter is provided in the combinations of the other references as shown above. As to the Applicant's argument with respect to prompt drying, depending on the amount of glycerol present, at some concentration values, glycerol will not inhibit the drying of the material and the concept of "prompt" is subjective that varies from one artisan to another.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

9. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MONZER R. CHORBAJI whose telephone number is (571) 272-1271. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

11. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, GLADYS J. CORCORAN can be reached on (571) 272-1214. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

12. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MRC



GLADYS J.P. CORCORAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER